To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC

Subject: RDA: Resource Description and Access - Review by other rule makers of June 2007 Draft of Chapters 6-7 - France

These are comments on the draft chapters 6-7 of RDA received from AFNOR Group CG46/CN357/GE6.

AFNOR CG46/CN357/GE6
"Evolution de la description bibliographique"

French Comments on RDA, Chapters 6 & 7

Comment category	Comments
	General comments
General	As Experts group AFNOR CG46/CN357/GE6 "Évolution de la description bibliographique" we appreciate the opportunity to give our view-point on the revised chapters 6 and 7 of RDA.
	We particularly welcome the real effort of structuring RDA according to the categories defined by FRBR Work, Expression, Manifestation, and Item but we regret it is not completed and we welcome too coming closer to DC that is a quite interesting initiative (harmonization of logics and interoperability).
General Clarity	Examples We suggest that examples should systematically be treated completely. - either the examples could be repeated in the different paragraphs so that the user could well see how the access points associated to the mentions which would be found in the bibliographic description would be distributed (it has been done for certain examples) - or the examples could have a comment which would give the indication of the other access points established for this description - - or the examples could be given in a complete form in an appendix at which could aim the partial example that illustrates the rule in the chapter
	Background – Changes in this draft
Background Changes in this draft **Organization of Chapter 6**	*1 - The Constituencies are asked to indicate whether they agree with retaining the detailed instructions for legal works, religious works, and official communications.* We do not see the need to go on with this distinction and we are opposed to it because a) in fact "legal works, religious works, and official communications" are not actual exceptions as they follow the general rule for choosing the access points; b) this distinction annihilates the real effort of structuring the RDA Chapter 6 according to the categories defined by FRBR Work, Expression, Manifestation, and Item. This analysis of resources is the same whatever the type of resource or the type of content. We think that legal works, religious works, and official communications should be integrated in the general rule and that the examples should be distributed there with their own appropriate comments. *2 - "…all instructions on determining the primary access point have been removed from chapter 6: they will be covered in Part B, chapter 13, in the context of "naming" a work or expression."* This decision and the lack of Chapter 13 have proved a hindrance to our reading of Chapter 6 and particularly to the right understanding of examples illustrating the different rules (see our particular comments below in the cell "Background Changes in this draft **Required access points"**). *3* - Other access points in the examples

Comment category	Comments
	From our point of view, the distribution of the other access points between direct access points as in chapter 6 and access points that indicate relationships as in chapter 7 is not indicated. When reading an example, the reader does not cease his/her reading with the name that is cited as the access point and he/she may ask: what to do with the other names ?
Background Changes in this draft **Designations of role**	"…to include in RDA an appendix containing a controlled vocabulary of terms designating roles. Work has begun on developing a list, along with definitions of the terms…" We are conscious of the constraint inherent to a work on designations of roles, however their lack in the examples has been much of a hindrance for an efficient reading of the chapter 6. Question: in the ultimate edition of these chapters will the designations of roles be present in the examples?
Background Changes in this draft **Required access points**	**1) Clarity** The examples have confronted us with a clarity problem : a single name as an access point without a designation of role and without relation to the other names appearing in the description (that are also potential access points relating to the description) has proved a hindrance to clearly understanding the illustrated rule when comparing it to the other rules on the choice of other possible access points relating to this description: (a)access point or no access point? On which criterion? (b) required access point (which one?) or optional access point? For example, page 6-18, example: Army Materials Technology Conference (2nd : 1973: Hyannis, Mass.) (*Access point representing the originating body for:* Ceramics for high performance applications : proceedings of the Second Army Materials Technology Conference, held at Hyannis, Massachusetts, November 13-16, 1973 / sponsored by Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center ; editors, John J. Burke, Alvin E. Gorum, R. Nathan Katz) In this example, 2 names of bodies appear in the description and it is necessary to wait till page 6-22 to notice that the second name of body is also an access point. **2) Criteria to choose the required access point** "In chapter 6, the following access points are labelled as "required": - Creator (or the creator commonly named first when citing the work, if there is more than one creator). - Originating body (If there is more than one originating body responsible for the work, only the access point for the originating body commonly named first when citing the work is required.)" a) general remark - "If there is more than one creator" the logic would be that all creators must be access points "creator" considering their responsibility on the work. There is no objective reason to prefer one rather than another. If the cataloguing agency for reasons of economy is unable or not willing to create all the access points, it may choose to create no access point "creator" at all and in this case each of the multiple creators remains equally treated as the others (according to the French rules, in this case the work is considered as"anonyme par excès d'auteurs" that is anonymous owing to too many authors). - but as RDA chooses to privilege one creator above another one, whatever the criterion used to choose him/her, it annihilates this equality between the creators. - on the other hand the criterion "commonly named first when citing the work" is ambiguous for us even disputable as it can be very different from country to country.

Comment category	Comments
	It will be necessary, if this rule is maintained per se, in the prospect of an international cataloguing code to define more precise rules on access points according to the different types of libraries, cataloguing agencies, other systems of information management organization, etc. and their level of bibliographical responsibility upon the records. If not, national choices will be made; that will prove an obstacle to the development of exchanges of bibliographical information and also to a joint searching in catalogues of more than one country. b) particular cases *1– Audiovisual works* The difference between the viewpoints as expressed in RDA and the French analysis is a matter of cultural background and the concept of intellectual property. a) - According to French law on intellectual property, an audiovisual work (a movie) is a collective work. As such it is considered as having no "creator". b) - However, it is customary in France as in other European countries to associate the name of the audiovisual work to the name of its director (commonly named first) and not to the name of its producer. *2– Aggregates* It is difficult to decide absolutely: it would be useful to specify which type of resource is described in the examples. Currently, in the French rules the required access point depends on the type of the resource described. From the examples in 6.4.1, it is not known if the implied persons or corporate bodies must all be "creator" or "contributor". What is the required access point? For example, page 6-27 "Performer", in the example Harris, Emmylou (*Access point representing the performer for:* Pieces of the sky. *Songs by various composers performed by Emmylou Harris*) which is the required access point if Harris, Emmylou is an optional access point according to the rule? In France, in this case, the performer is the required access point because he/she unifies the described "aggregate work". *3– Musical works in adaptations or arrangements :* In France we distinguish: - on one hand the ephemeral arrangements or adaptations that are considered as expressions of the original work - on the other hand, the adaptations that remain overtime. These latter ones are considered as new works. According to the French standard on access points to musical works (AFNOR Z44-079 1993 *Documentation – Catalogage – Forme et structure des vedettes titres musicaux, "* adaptations and arrangements of musical works are the subject of an access associated with the heading of the adapter - if the adaptation is listed in the thematic catalogue of the work of this author, - if it has an opus number in his/her work or - if it is a reference edition: for example, Berlioz, Hector. – [Hymne des Marseillais, H 51] *and not* : Rouget de Lisle, Claude Joseph. – [Chant de guerre de l'armée du Rhin]. Adapt. *4– Dictionaries* We did not see in RDA in Chapter 6 the case of dictionaries that do not have an author responsible for them For this case, in France, the publisher or the publishing house is considered globally as the "originating body" and the access point is made with the name of this publisher or of this publishing house: for example the "Dictionnaire Larousse" for which the issuing body Larousse is originating body for the dictionary.

Comment category	Comments
	5– Plagiarisms We did not see in RDA in Chapter 6 the case of plagiarisms. Is the author of a plagiarism considered as the creator of the work based on the pre-existing work? Do plagiarisms belong to this category? Example of plagiarism in BnF catalogue with access points to the real creator of the work and to the plagiarist: Carpani, Giuseppe (1751-1825). *Creator* Lettres écrites de Vienne en Autriche sur le célèbre compositeur Jh Haydn [Texte imprimé], suivies d'une Vie de Mozart, et de Considérations sur Métastase et l'état présent de la musique en France et en Italie, par Louis-Alexandre-César Bombet. - Paris : P. Didot l'aîné, 1814. - In-8 , 468 p. Plagiat commis par Stendhal, d'après Cordier et Quérard, Supercheries littéraires: en grande partie traduction non avouée de "Le Haydine", de Giuseppe Carpani, publié à Milan en 1812, et de "Mozarts Leben", de Friedrich Schlichtegroll, publié à Graz en 1794. - Cordier, Bibliographie stendhalienne. - Quérard, Supercheries littéraires other access points Stendhal (1783-1842). *Creator* Schlichtegroll, Friedrich (1765-1822. *Creator* Comment : This manifestation contains plagiarisms of two creators byStendhal who committed them under another pseudonym Louis-Alexandre-César Bombet. So access points are made to the creators of the two works and to the plagiarist.
Background Changes in this draft **Originating body**	"The constituencies are asked to indicate whether they agree with the treatment of Originating bodies at 6.3.2… "Originating body" was chosen as it came closest to indicating responsibility for the work (as opposed to responsibility for publication of the manifestation" We agree upon the use of "originating body" which expresses correctly the relationship between the corporate body and the work or its expression and which is clearer than "issuing body". We agree with the treatment in 6.3.2; however, in 6.3.2.0.1, we consider that cartographic works must not be a particular case.
Background Changes in this draft **Examples in Chapter 6**	"If there are concerns about the existing form of examples, please advise which of the options above is preferred." - Why not keep the current presentation of the examples which seems to us excellent as it appears in this draft? - We think that the specification of role should be given as soon as an access point is created (cf. 6.2.0.1 that says: "Record an appropriate term … to indicate explicitly the function."). - The lack of designations of roles in chapter 6 is much prejudicial to the clarity and consistency of the given examples, particularly for countries that do not use AACR and that can have different choices. - The lack of the rule on the primary access point (currently chapter 13 is missing) is a hindrance in understanding correctly the given examples and in reasoning about the choices made. It would be useful to indicate if the other access points to other names present in the example are made via direct access points (rules of chapter 6) or via links to related works or expressions (rules of chapter 7). For example page 6-14, in the example Gray, Patsey (*Access point representing the creator for:* J.R.R. Tolkien's The hobbit / dramatized by Patricia Gray), what is the access point to Tolkien ? Is it a supplementary access point to the record or is it a link to Tolkien's work ? It is not visible in th example. See also above our comment in the cell "Background Changes in this draft **Required access points)".**

Comment category	Comments
	- It would be useful to specify in the comment for each example the type of the resource being analysed.
	- It would be useful to number the examples within the different paragraphs when they are numerous as it would be an help to the reading, to the location and to the citations.
	Chapter 6 – Detailed comments
	6.3.1 Creator
Consistency	6.3.1.Creator, Note 1 (page 6-7) "If there is more than one creator responsible for the work, only the access point for the creator commonly named first when citing the work is required." Only the commonly named first when citing the work is a required access point when in a resource, more than one creator has the same level of responsibility and other name(s) have no access point at all: it surely wont help users of catalogues to retrieve resources. At least there should be something to explain why this arbitrary choice is made.
Clarity	6.3.1.0.3 A person, family, or corporate body responsible for compiling an aggregate work may be considered to be a creator of the compilation if the selection, arrangement, editing, etc., of content for the compilation effectively results in the creation of a new work In the case of compilations "best-of-…" who is considered as the "creator"? Is it the compiler? Is it the creator of the compiled works? Is it the person (creator or performer) who unifies the compilation (it is the rule applying in France)? <u>Question</u>: According to RDA which is the required access point?
Consistency	Chapter 6, 6.3.1.1.1 Provide an access point for a creator, *Two or more persons, families, or corporate bodies responsible for the creation of the work performing different roles*, page 6-13, Example Hofmannsthal, Hugo von Strauss, Richard (*Access points representing the creators for:* Der Rosenkavalier : Komödie für Musik in drei Aufzügen / von Hugo von Hofmannsthal ; Musik von Richard Strauss. *A libretto*) According to the comment of this example, only the libretto is published. In this case, the composer cannot be the creator. Here, the name of the composer should be an access point according to 6.3.4. "Other person … associated with the work" ,or, even better, through the relationship with the opera as in chapter 7
Clarity	Chapter 6, 6.3.1.1.1 Provide an access point for a creator, *Person, family, or corporate body responsible for creating a new work based on a previously existing work*, page 6-14 In these cases, how is treated the "creator" of the previously existing work? Is it through the relationship with other works in chapter 7.5.1?
	6.3.2 Originating body
Consistency	6.3..2 Originating body, page 6-15, Note 1 "If there is more than one originating body responsible for the work, only the access point for the originating body commonly named first when citing the work is required." Only the commonly named first when citing the work is a required access point

Comment category	Comments
	when in a resource, more than one originating body has the same level of responsibility and other name(s) have no access point at all: it surely wont help users of catalogues to retrieve resources. At least there should be something to explain why this arbitrary choice is made.

Clarity	Chapter 6, page 6-16
	6.3.2.1.1. Provide an access point for an originating body
	
	Example
	Victoria and Albert Museum
	Peabody Essex Museum
	(*Access points representing the originating bodies for:* Furniture from British India and Ceylon : a catalogue of the collections in the Victoria and Albert Museum and the Peabody Essex Museum / Amin Jaffer assisted in Salem by Karina Corrigan and with a contribution by Robin D. Jones ; photographs by Mike Kitcatt, Markham Sexton and Jeffrey Dykes. — Salem, Mass. : Peabody Essex Museum in association with V& A Publications)
	
	What is the access point for the person author of the catalogue ? For us it would seem useful
	
	  - either to retrieve this example under the bullet corresponding to the type of access retained for "person"
	
	  - or to remind the other retained access points at the end of the comment.
	
	<u>Question:</u> in the case when a corporate body has the initiative for the resource and there is also a person as "creator", what is the required access point? Rules would be very useful in order to avoid differing choices depending on the cataloguing agencies.
	
	   In France, if a Work results from a collaboration or exchange between a person or family and a corporate body, two cases are distinguished :
	
	  a) if the person, family does not belong to the corporate body, it is considered that this person, family has the same responsibility for creating the work as the corporate body (i.e "creator"); However in French standards, rules are not defined to choose which of the person or corporate body is the primary access point. At the BnF, in the Department of official publications, the corporate body is always chosen as the primary access point in order to collocate resources related to the corporate body.- the publications of corporate bodies prove to be difficult to trace and the life of a corporate body is longer than that of a person
	
	b) if the person, family belongs to the corporate body it is considered that this person or family is simply a draftsman and therefore an access point "contributor" is always used for this person, family.

Discrepancy with French rules	6.3.1.1.1 *Two or more persons, families, or corporate bodies responsible for the creation of the work performing the same role*
	
	Example (page 6-11)
	
	Gikow, Louise
	Lewis, Jim
	(*Access points representing the creators for:* Miss Piggy's rules : swinetested secrets for catching Mr. Right, keeping him & throwing him back when you've had enough / by Miss Piggy as told to Louise Gikow and Jim Lewis. *Gikow and Lewis are the actual authors*)
	
	   <u>Question:</u> Will this case be treated in Part B of RDA?
	
	   According to French rules, if no public source or source known to catalogue users allows to identify the hoax an access point is made for Miss Piggy for any user may search under that name particularly in printed bibliography or catalogue.
	
	   If it is publicly ascertained that it is really a hoax, only a simple cross-reference from the name of the would-be author to the name of the actual author is made in the authority record.

Comment category	Comments
Consistency	Chapter 6, point 6.3.2.0.1 Scope d) Cartographic works originating with a corporate body responsible for more than just publication or distribution There is no reason to make a particular case for <u>cartographic</u> works as it applies also to other types of material as photographs for example where corporate bodies act as originating bodies different from "a body that is merely responsible for just publication or distribution." We suggest to delete the term "cartographic" from the bullet d) in the scope and to add a sentence such as "it applies especially to cartographic resources, photographs, moving images, etc." See our General comment above in the cell "Background – changes in this draft **Originating body"**
Consistency	6.3.2.1.1 Cartographic works originating with a corporate body responsible for more than just publication or distribution - In this subheading (page 6-19) delete the term "cartographic" (as suggested for 6.3.2.0.1 Scope d)) and add examples corresponding to other types of resources (photographs, videograms, films, etc.). Example for a photograph: Auerbacher, Dominique (1955-....). Photographe De la Série"Lieux communs":"Lyon" [Image fixe numérisée] / Dominique Auerbacher, photogr.. - [Paris] : [Délégation à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'action régionale], [1986-1987]. - 56 photogr. pos. : n. et b. ; 25 x 25 cm (épr.). Photographies prises dans le cadre de la Mission Photographique de la DATAR, 1984-1988. France. Délégation à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'action régionale
Consistency	6.3.2.1.1 Cartographic works originating with a corporate body responsible for more than just publication or distribution - Example Rand McNally and Company (*Access point representing the originating body for:* Historical atlas of the world / Rand McNally. *Maps copyrighted by Rand McNally & Company*) This example is ambiguous (out of scope). The comment "maps copyrighted" is not explicit enough to know for certain if McNally and company is a body "responsible for more than just publication or distribution",
	6.3.4 Other person, family, or corporate body associated with the work
Clarity	6.3.4 Other person, family, or corporate body associated with the work Scope 6.3.4.0.2 (page 6-21 "Other persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with the work include the person, etc., to whom correspondence is addressed, the person, etc., honoured by a festschrift, sponsoring bodies, production companies, the institution, etc., hosting an exhibition or event, etc." This part of the scope is not sufficiently accurate. We note that the dedicatees of works – in particular in the case of antique resources - are missing.
Discrepancy with French rules	6.3.4.1.1 Provide an access point for a person … if considered important for access (page 6-22), Examples

Comment category	Comments
	European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (*Access point representing the sponsoring body for:* Policing racist crime and violence : a comparative analysis / prepared by Robin Oakley on behalf of the EUM Illinois. Institute of Environmental Quality (*Access points representing the sponsoring bodies for:* Hydrogen sulfide health effects and recommended air quality standard / prepared for the Illinois Institute of Environmental Quality by the Environmental Health For each of these two cases the French rules demand two required access points, one "creator" and one "originating body".
Consistency	6.3.4.1.1 Provide an access point for a person … if considered important for access Example (page 6-22) California Academy of Sciences (*Access point representing the issuing body for:* Occasional papers of the California Academy of Sciences) California Academy of Sciences is an originating body and should be a required access point according to 6.3.2.
	6.4 Access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the expression
Consistency	6.4 Access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the expression In a code referring to FRBR and in a time when FRBR are intended to be implemented in catalogues in order to make retrieval and display of results easier, it is rather surprising that the access points related to Expressions are declared optional considering that it is by using these access points that different Expressions of a same Work may be distinguished. This seems to be a lack of consistency…
Consistency	6.4.1 Contributor - 6.4.1.0.Scope 6.4.1.0.2 Contributors include editors, translators, arrangers of music, performers, directors, cinematographers, etc. Access points to contributors named in this paragraph should be required
Discrepancy with French rules	6.4.1.1.1 Performer (page 6-27), Example Harris, Emmylou (*Access point representing the performer for:* Pieces of the sky. *Songs by various composers performed by Emmylou Harris*) In this case, in France, the performer is a required access point when he/she unifies the resource described.
Discrepancy with French rules	6.4.1.1.1 Other contributor (page 6-29) Performers are not always contributors for access points. In some cases, the performer is considered as the required access point. According to French rules, the performer is always used as the required access point for the resource, if the unity of the resource is given by the performer. For example, in the case of recitals.
Clarity	6.4.1.1.1 Other contributor (page 6-29), Example Smith, D. E. Huger (Access point representing the other contributor for: A Carolina rice plantation of the fifties : 30 paintings in water-colour / by Alice R. Huger Smith ; narrative by Herbert Ravenel Sass ; with chapters from the unpublished memoirs of D.E. Huger Smith) The comment for this example does not mention if the "unpublished memoirs" have a title or not. If these "memoirs" have a title, they should be recorded according

Comment category	Comments
	to the rules in chapter 7 Related resources
	If these memoirs have no title, indicate in a comment "the unpublished memoirs have no title".
	6.5 Access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the manifestation
Clarity	6.5.0 General guidelines 6.5.0.2 If the resource contains two or more manifestations, provide access points as instructed under 6.5.1–6.5.3 for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with <u>each of the manifestations in the resource.</u> We do not understand this rule: how can the resource described contain two or more manifestations as the bibliographic description is equivalent to a manifestation? What do RDA refer to? Collections of pamphlet volumes, works overtime as serials or multipart monographs, etc.? Examples would be useful to clarify the rule.
Clarity	6.5.1 Producer (page 6-30 & 6-31) A **producer** is a person, family, or corporate body responsible for creating, inscribing, fabricating, constructing, or manufacturing (printing, duplicating, casting, etc.) a manifestation. This definition of "producer" considers only one type of responsibility, that is manufacturing, etc. a manifestation. However in the case of audio-visual resources the term "producer" has two meanings: According to the French analysis the "producer" for audiovisual resources does not come only under the manifestation but also under the expression. The first meaning indicates always a corporate body and the responsibility is that of manufacturing, etc. a manifestation The second meaning indicates always a person, the artistic director (whom in American-English is referred to by the same term "producer") whose responsibility is upon the realisation of a content (expression). Supporting our analysis is that in 6.4.1.0.2 the directors, cinematographers are designated as contributors. The term "producer" is quite ambiguous for us and we suppose that the glossary will give all useful explanations.
Clarity	6.5.1 Producer The case of the producer (printer) for antique books is missing; this notion is very important and for us the producer is always a required access point., as shown in the following example from BnF catalogue : Duclos, Charles (1704-1772) Considerations sur les moeurs de ce siécle [Texte imprimé]. Par M. Duclos, historiographe de France, l'un des quarante de l'Académie françoise, & de celle des Belles-Lettres. Nouvelle édition. - A Paris, chez Prault fils, libraire, quay de Conti, vis-à-vis la descente du Pont-Neuf, à la Charité. 1751. Avec approbation & privilége du Roi (<u>De l'imprimerie de Ballard, seul imprimeur du Roi</u>, pour la musique, & noteur de la chapelle de Sa Majesté, rue Saint-Jean-de-Beauvais, à Sainte Cecile). - ... Ballard, Christophe-Jean-François (1701-1765). Imprimeur-libraire
Clarity	6.5.2 Publisher 6.5.2.1.1 Provide an access point(s) for a publisher(s) of the resource, if considered important for access. The case of the publisher for antique books is missing; this notion is very

Comment category	Comments
	important and for us the publisher is always a required access point, as shown as above in the same example from BnF catalogue. Duclos, Charles (1704-1772) Considerations sur les moeurs de ce siécle [Texte imprimé]. Par M. Duclos, historiographe de France, l'un des quarante de l'Académie françoise, & de celle des Belles-Lettres. Nouvelle édition. - A Paris, <u>chez Prault fils,</u> libraire, quay de Conti, vis-à-vis la descente du Pont-Neuf, à la Charité. 1751. Avec approbation & privilége du Roi (De l'imprimerie de Ballard, seul imprimeur du Roi, pour la musique, & noteur de la chapelle de Sa Majesté, rue Saint-Jean-de-Beauvais, à Sainte Cecile). - ... Prault, Laurent-François (1712-1780). Imprimeur-libraire
	6.6 Access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the item
Consistency	6.6 Access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the item This chapter mentions none of the access points relating to the peculiarities of items for antique books, precious books, scores, etc. This chapter deals only with mentions relating to owners or custodians but it exists many more peculiarities. It would be useful to enhance this chapter with all pecularities relating to copies as dedicatee/dedicator, ex-dono, binder, author of marginalia, etc. See the previous draft of chapter 6 in December 2005 Item-specific information , part 6.2.1 Recording item-specific details of early printed resources. These mentions are important for copies (antique resources, bibliophilism) as shown in the following example for a precious copfrom the BnF catalogue Jacob, Max (1876-1944) Le cornet à dés [Texte imprimé] / Max Jacob. - [Paris] : [M. Jacob], [1917] (Paris : Impr. Levé). - 191 p. -[1] f. de front. : 1 portr. ; 20 cm. Talvart et Place, t. 10, p. 19. - Éd. originale. - Reproduction du portrait de l'auteur par Picasso pour les ex. sur hollande Picasso, Pablo (1881-1973). Illustrateur Bonet, Paul (1889-1971). Destinataire de l'envoi. Pour l'ex. RES 8-NFZ-16Relieur. Pour l'ex. RES 8-NFZ-16Ancien possesseur. Pour l'ex. RES 8-NFZ-16 Jacob, Max (1876-1944). Auteur de l'envoi. Pour l'ex. RES 8-NFZ-16. Annotations manuscrites.Pour l'ex. RES 8-NFZ-16 Illustrateur de l'exemplaire. Pour l'ex. RES 8-NFZ-16 Ragazzoni, François. Ancien possesseur. Pour l'ex. RES 8-NFZ-16 Particularités de l'exemplaire Un des 30 ex. non numéroté sur hollande. - Envoi autogr. de l'auteur à Paul Bonet suivi d'un texte manuscrit signé par l'auteur, intitulé "Petit historique du Cornet à dés", 10 dessins originaux dont sept autoportraits et 29 poèmes autographes écrits sur les p. ou les espaces blancs du livre ; rel. à la fin : les premières p. de l'éd. définitive du Cornet à dés (Gallimard, 1945), comprenant le "Petit historique du Cornet à dés" imprimé pour la première fois et dédié à Paul Bonet. - Reliure signée et datée 1954 de Paul Bonet : box bleu très foncé orné sur chaque plat d'une composition de rectangles juxtaposés en oblique, mosaïqués en box vert clair, vert foncé et bleu marine, encadrant une main elle-même mosaïquée et traversée de formes déchiquetées (P. Bonet, Carnets, n° 1072). - Prov. : Paul Bonet (ex-libris) ; François Ragazzoni (ex-libris ; vente, Paris, Hôtel Georges V, 13. V.2003, n° 131)
	6.7 Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with legal works **6.8 Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with religious works** **6.9 Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with official communications**
Consistency	Parts 6.7, 6.8, and 6.9 don't follow the FRBR. See our general comment at the beginning of these comments, cell "Background Changes in this draft **Organization**

Comment category	Comments
	of Chapter 6"
	6.7 Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with legal works
Local	6.7 Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with legal works In a general way this chapter refers to Anglo-Saxon law (for example, 6.7.2., 6.7.3) with certain rules very precise and specific which do not come under an international code (see in particular 6.7.7.1)
Consistency	6.7.1 Persons and corporate bodies associated with laws, etc. Optional The optionality for corporate bodies is in total contradiction with 6.3.2 Originating body Required
Consistency	6.7.5.3 The Holy See as a signatory to an agreement It is not necessary to make a particular case of the Holy See, it is a corporate body as any other corporate body.
Consistency	6.7.7.1.1 Person or corporate body prosecuted in a criminal trial, etc. This rule is out of place in an international code as it amounts to a violation of a person's rights.
	6.8 Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with religious works
Consistency	6.8 Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with religious works In a general way when the Catholic Church is concerned it is the creator of the liturgy. For other Christian Churches when there is no known creator of the liturgy and when several Churches from the same faith publish this liturgy, the access point to the issuing Church should be an access point "contributor" and not "creator".
Consistency	6.8.1. Persons associated with sacred scriptures 6.8.1.1. Isaiah (*Access point representing the creator for:* The book of Isaiah) Which Isaiah ? From the current biblical studies, there are three Isaiah. It seems strange to create an access point "creator" to a person for sacred scripture. We disagree on creating an access point to a person for sacred scripture as the current and general way to deal with it is in creating a uniform title. Will part B consider the case ?
	6.9 Acess points for persons and corporate bodies associated with official communications
Consistency	6.9.1 Corporate access points for the official issuing the communication The form of the access points do not conform with IFLA recommendations (Form and structure of Corporate Headings).
Preference	6.9.1 Corporate access points for the official issuing the communication We would prefer an access point required for the corporate body and not an optional one.
	Chapter 7 – Detailed comments
Clarity	Chapter 7 General comments It would be a great help if the nature of the relationship would be specified

Comment category	Comments
	systematically in the examples
Consistency Clarity	Chapter 7 General comments It would be useful to introduce a rule on the way to record the designation of relationships in parts a) Identifiers and b) Naming…
	Chapter 7 There is a type of relationship that RDA Chapter 7 not mentioned : "generative relationships" which are particularly important for cinematographic and audiovisual works. (see definition and graphical representation below as proposed to the group CEN – BR/TF 179 [CEN = Commission des œuvres cinématographiques et audiovisuelles nationales] adapted from Barbara Tillett's "Bibliographic relationships", figure 2 in "Relationships in the organization of knowledge", edited by Carol A. Bean and Rebecca Green, 2001 and so, closely connected with FRBR concept of work) Definition: *Relationships are defined among the entities in the hierarchy of work, expression, manifestation, and item.* *Content relationships can be viewed as a continuum from works/expressions/manifestations/items.* **Generative relationships** *: these comprise works or contents that have been produced during the process of creation of some original work.* *Equivalent relationships : …* *Derivative relationships: …* *Descriptive relationships: ….* **Whole/part and part to part relationships** *Whole/part relationships: …".* *Part to part relationships …* *.* Graphical representation:

Comment category	Comments
	7.2 Designation of relationship
Consistency	7.2 vs 7.1.3.0.2 7.2 Designation of relationship is declared "Optional", which seems contradictory with the recommendation in 7.1.3.0.2 "Record a designation of relationship in conjunction with an identifier for the related resource to indicate the nature of the relationship between the resource described and the referenced resource (see 7.2)."
	7.3 Primary relationships
Consistency	7.3.1 Relationship between a work and an expression of the work and 7.3.2. relationship between a manifestation and a work or expression embodied in the manifestation In these two sub-chapters examples with "uniform title" are missing for sacred works and liturgical works while sub-chapter 6.8 details access points to persons for the same works. From that, it could be inferred that RDA do not envisage uniform title access points for that type of work while it is mentioned that primary relationships are required.
Clarity	7.3.1.0 a) Identifiers linking the work and expression It would be useful to have an example of ISRC as identifier in bullet 7.3.1.0.1a.1 ISRC : DE-K23-82-887-00 *(international Standard Recording Code for* Avalon, *an album interpreted by Roxy Music and produced by Polygram).*
Consistency	7.3.2 Relationship between a manifestation and a work or expression embodied in the manifestation It would be useful to have an example of ISRC as identifier in bullet 7.3.2.0.1a.1 Identifiers linking the work, as ISRC typically identifies an expression.
	7.5 Derivative relationships
Clarity	7.5.0.1.1 A **derivative relationship** is a relationship between a work or expression and a modification based on that work or expression. The word "modification" is not precise enough for non native English-speakers like us: the term "modification" in French means the action and the result of this action. So we would prefer a wording that insists on the result, if it is possible: "the result of a modification" instead of " a modification".
	7.6 Descriptive relationships
Consistency	7.6.2 Describing work (or expression) 7.6.2.1.1a.1, 2nd example *Commentary published:* A commentary on Gabriel Marcel's The mystery of being / Thomas C. Anderson. — ISBN 978-0-87462-669-8 (*Resource described:* The mystery of being / by Gabriel Marcel ; English translation by René Hague. *ISBN provided in conjunction with a description of the describing work*) An ISBN being an identifier for a manifestation and not for a work or an expression, it would be relevant to delete the ISBN in this example. If it exists the ISTC for this expression should be provided.
	7.7 Whole-part relationships
Clarity	7.7 Whole-part relationships

Comment category	Comments
	7.7.1.1.1b.1 Naming the whole work (or expression), 2nd example *Series:* Journal of psychology and Judaism (*Resource described:* The family : Biblical and psychological foundations / Kalman J. Kaplan, M.W. Schwartz, and Moriah Markus-Kaplan. *Special issue of* Journal of psychology and Judaism) The way to name the relationship is strange for the meaning seems to indicate that "The family: biblical and psychological foundations…" is itself the whole part. If the resource described is a special issue the naming should be either in the form "Special issue of: Journal…" or, if a generic formula is preferred in the form "Belongs to series: Journal …"
	7.9 Sequential relationships
Clarity	7.9.1 Preceding work (or expression) 7.9.1.1.1a.1 Resource identifier for the preceding work Example ISSN 1043-7479 = Arctic & antarctic regions (*Resource described:* PolarInfo. *ISSN provided in conjunction with the key title for the preceding work*) According to rules given in 7.1.3.0.2, the designation of relationship is missing: *Former title:* ISSN 1043-7479 = Arctic & antarctic regions
Clarity	7.9.2.1.1b.1 b) Naming the succeeding work (or expression) Example *Sequel:* Harris, Edwin. John Jasper's gatehouse (*Resource described:* The mystery of Edwin Drood / Charles Dickens. *Harris' work is a sequel to Dickens' unfinished last novel*) and 7.9.2.1.1c.1 c) Describing the succeeding work (or expression) Example *Sequel:* Scarlett : the sequel to Margaret Mitchell's Gone with the wind / by Alexandra Ripley. — New York, NY : Warner Books, 1991 In these two examples, we do not know if "Sequel" means that the work "has" a sequel or if it means that the work "is" a sequel. Why not use something like "Has for sequel" to specify the direction of the relationship as it is the case in the following example of 7.9.1.1.1b.1 b) Naming the preceding work (or expression) *Sequel to:* Planet of the apes (Motion picture : 1968) (*Resource described:* Beneath the planet of the apes) ?
	Typo
Typo	7.3.2.0.1c.1 **G**allimard and not Callimard
Typo	7.5.2.1.1c.1 Examples page 7-20 1st example : espa**ñ**ol & not espanol 3rd example : America**'**s military & not America"s military